

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

PATRICK MICK,

Plaintiff,

V.

SEASPACE CORPORATION, et al.,

## Defendants.

CASE NO. C20-1201JLR

## ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE

On August 7, 2020, Plaintiff Patrick Mick filed this action for personal injuries he suffered while working as a longshoreman on a vessel he alleges was managed and owned by Defendants Seaspan Corporation and Seaspan Ship Management Ltd. Specifically, “Defendants”). (Compl. (Dkt. # 1).) He amended his complaint on January 1, 2021. (Am. Compl. (Dkt. # 12).) On July 28, 2021, after following Hague Convention procedures to serve Defendants in Hong Kong, Mr. Mick filed an affidavit of service. DSC Resp. (Dkt. # 17); Aff. (Dkt. # 18) (noting that Mr. Mick had served

Defendants on June 1, 2021).) Counsel for Defendants appeared in this matter on August 12, 2021. (8/12/21 Not. (Dkt. # 19).)

Nearly seventeen months have now passed since counsel for Defendants appeared in this action. Nevertheless, Defendants have not answered the amended complaint, and Mr. Mick has not moved for default. (*See generally* Dkt.) Accordingly, the court ORDERS Mr. Mick to SHOW CAUSE why this case should not be dismissed for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) (authorizing dismissal with prejudice for failure to prosecute); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir. 1986) (noting that a district court has “inherent power *sua sponte* to dismiss a case for lack of prosecution”). Mr. Mick must respond to this show cause order by **January 20, 2023**. Failure to timely respond to this order to show cause may result in the dismissal of this action with prejudice. *See Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423 (discussing factors that the court considers in determining whether to dismiss for failure to prosecute).

Dated this 10th day of January, 2023.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES L. ROBART  
United States District Judge